

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are pending in the case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the remarks.

The Title of the Invention has been objected to as not being descriptive. The Title of the Invention has been amended and is believed to technically accurate and descriptive. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12, 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burgan et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0016163). The Examiner stated essentially that Burgan teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 3-7, 12, 14-18.

Claims 1 and 12 claim, *inter alia*, "creating a wireless markup language document including a client profile and a client posted message; and synchronizing each client's view of the wireless markup language document."

Burgan teaches a chat server for managing the communication of a plurality of chat discussions, facilitating substantially real time communications among a plurality of wireless communications devices (see Abstract). Burgan teaches sending an introduction message including information about a new chat topic such as the originator and other subscribers (see paragraph [0037]). Burgan teaches protocols for communicating a chat message (see paragraphs [0060-0061] and Figures 10 and 11). Burgan does not teach, "creating a wireless markup language document including a client profile and a client posted message; and synchronizing each client's view of the wireless markup language document." The protocol for messages of Burgan includes an address, a topic, and a message (see Figures 10 and 11). Nowhere does Burgan teach that the protocol is a

markup language. Thus, Burgan does not teach, “creating a wireless markup language document including a client profile” as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Burgan fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 12.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Claims 13-18 depend from claim 12. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 12. At least claims 5, 6, 16 and 17 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 5 and 16 claim, “wherein the collaboration space includes a client moderator.”

Burgan teaches a server monitor (see paragraph [0036]). Burgan does not teach, “wherein the collaboration space includes a client moderator,” as claimed in claims 5 and 16. The server monitor is hardware programmed with a set of rules. Clearly the server monitor is not a client, for example, the server monitor does not have an identification (see claims 1 and 12). Therefore, Burgan fails to teach that “the collaboration space includes a client moderator,” as claimed in claims 5 and 16.

Claims 6 and 17 claim, “defining a privilege for client, wherein the privilege defines access to document content.”

Burgan teaches that a subscriber list, listing users a requester wishes to include in a chat group (see paragraph [0037]). The subscriber list defines who receives a start up message. Burgan does not teach “defining a privilege for client, wherein the privilege defines access to document content” as claimed in claims 6 and 17. The subscriber list defines who is invited to a chat session. Thus, the subscriber list is a topic level privilege. The subscriber list does not define content level privileges. Therefore, Burgan fails to teach “defining a privilege for client, wherein the privilege defines access to document

content” as claimed in claims 6 and 17.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 8-11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burgan in view of Pearl et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 20020083035). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Burgan and Pearl teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 2, 8-11, and 13.

Claim 8 claims, *inter alia*, “a world wide web server hosting a wireless application protocol Chat service for managing collaborators on a session-per-user basis, the world wide web server connected to the wireless application protocol gateway and generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client.”

Burgan teaches a chat server for managing the communication of a plurality of chat discussions, facilitating substantially real time communications among a plurality of wireless communications devices (see Abstract). Burgan does not teach or suggest, a world wide web server “generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client” essentially as claimed in claim 8. The chat server of Burgan interactively manages the traffic associated with a plurality of chat discussions (see paragraph [0029]). The chat server merely manages traffic. The chat server of Burgan does not generate a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client. Thus, Burgan does not teach or suggest, “a world wide web server hosting a wireless application protocol Chat service for managing collaborators on a session-per-user basis, the world wide web server connected to the wireless application protocol gateway and generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless

application protocol client” as claimed in claim 8.

Pearl teaches a method for stripping text data from web pages and providing the text data to legacy devices (see paragraph [0003]). Pearl does not teach or suggest, a world wide web server “generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client” essentially as claimed in claim 8. Pearl teaches content provided as e-mail and instant messages to users (see Tables 3 and 15). The text conveyed by Pearl is not in a markup language. In fact, Pearl teaches that markup language is removed from content to provide clients with pure text, wherein non-text portions of an original MIME-type are not preserved (see paragraphs [0056-0057]). Therefore, Pearl does not teach or suggest a world wide web server “generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client” as claimed in claim 8. Therefore, Pearl fails to cure the deficiencies of Burgan.

The combined teachings of Burgan and Pearl fail to teach or suggest that a world wide web server “generating a wireless markup language interface for the wireless application protocol client” as claimed in claim 8.

Claims 9 and 11 depend from claim 8. Claims 2 and 13 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 19 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 claims, “wherein the wireless markup language interface is stored on the world wide web server and served to the wireless application protocol client, wherein a wireless application protocol client message sent to the world wide web server is added to

the wireless markup language interface.”


Neither Burgan nor Pearl are believed to teach or suggest an interface stored on a world wide web server and served to the wireless application protocol client. Burgan and Pearl teach that clients have their own view of content. Therefore, the combined teachings of Burgan and Pearl fail to teach or suggest “wherein the wireless markup language interface is stored on the world wide web server and served to the wireless application protocol client, wherein a wireless application protocol client message sent to the world wide web server is added to the wireless markup language interface” as claimed in claim 19.

New claims 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 12.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-9 and 11-21, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner’s early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 1, 2004


Donald B. Paschburg
Reg. No. 33,753
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3191
(732) 321-3030 (FAX)